

UNITED STATES DETERTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. MO-5494/LEA T ECKEL 02/07/00 09/485,288 **EXAMINER** IM22/0711 HOKE, V BAYER CORPORATION PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH PA 15205-9741 1714 DATE MAILED: 07/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/485,288

Applicant(s)

ECKEL ET AL

Examiner

VERONICA P. HOKE

Art Unit 1714

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply	within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
 be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
1) 🔀 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>May 23, 20</u>	
2a) ☑ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance exceeds in accordance with the practice under Ex particle.	ept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is te Quayle35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	the manding in the applied
4) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 8-10, and 15-17</u>	is/are pending in the applica
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from considera
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 🕅 Claim(s) 1-6, 8-10, and 15-17	is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirer
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	e objected to by the Examiner.
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a □ approved b) □ disapproved.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign prior	ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐None of:	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have t	peen received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have I	peen received in Application No
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority doct application from the International Bureau *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the company of the c	(FOT Rule 17.2(a)).
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).	
Attachment(s)	
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Cther:

Application/Control Number: 09/485288

Art Unit: 1714

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6,8-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 07-11119 taken with Lee, Kakegawa et al and Nishihara et al for the reasons stated in paper no. 4 mailed December 21, 2000...

To the contrary (response at page 4) Nishihara et al relates similarly in col.7, lines 47-58, that the styrene-grafted rubber component's particle size may be as low as 0.1 micron ("as low as 0.1..."). Accordingly there can hardly said to be any unexpected criticality in this aspect.

The remaining argument is like wise untenable because all three of the secondary references tend to suggest that monophosphates while less compatible than the oligomeric phosphates, improve their flameproofing efficiency and thus beneficial primarily as an adjunct flame retarder. Nishihara states (col.11, line 11- col.12, line 17) that impact strength is benefited. Kakegawa relates (col. 7, line 28- col.8, line 20) that upto 30 % supplementation of the oligomeric phosphate by the monophosphate is beneficial. Lee relates (col.4, lines 60-63) that mixtures of the two types, i.e. where n= 0 as typified by triphenyl phosphate (TPP) and oligomers wherein n is 1 or more, do not manifest the juicing problem representative of the monophosphate. Physical properties are equally benefited by using the blend instead. Hence utilizing the blend in lieu of the oligomeric phosphates per se of the primary reference in a PC/polystyrene blend wherein the

Application/Control Number: 09/485288 Page 3

Art Unit: 1714

grafted styrene component contains a diene (or acrylate) rubber having a particle size as small as 0.1 micron and a glass transition temperature lower than 0 C is prima facie obvious.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

VERONICA P. HOKE PRIMARY EXAMINER

vph

July 10, 2001

703 308-2444